

Appln No. 09/693,565

Amdt date March 29, 2004

Reply to Offic action of January 27, 2004

#### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-10 and 17-20 remain in the present application. Claims 21-24 have been canceled herein. Claims 1, 7 and 17 have been amended. Applicants do not believe that the amendments to claims 1, 7 and 17 would require an additional search. Therefore, applicants respectfully request that the amendment to claims 1, 7 and 17 be entered. Further, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-10 and 17-20.

#### **I. Withdrawal of Claims 21-24**

Newly submitted claims 21-24 have been withdrawn from consideration as allegedly being directed to a non-elected invention. In response, claims 21-24 are canceled herein.

#### **II. Rejection of Claims 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §101**

Claims 17-20 have been rejected because they allegedly lack patentable utility under 35 U.S.C. §101. The Office Action states that claims 17-20 only claim the manipulation of data but perform no concrete, useful or tangible result. The Office Action further states that this rejection could be overcome by including a positive recitation of a report being generated.

Applicants traverse the rejection of at least claim 20 because claims 20 does positively recite that "the system generates a print-out that includes the deposit information, a store number, the sequence number and the alternate sequence number after the occurrence of the armored car pickup." (Emphasis Added).

**Appln No. 09/693,565**

**Amdt date March 29, 2004**

**Reply to Office action of January 27, 2004**

Applicants have amended claim 17 to explicitly state that which was implicit in the original claim. Claim 17 now recites "a central control unit which receives the deposit information from the safe assembly, updates a sequence number and an alternate sequence number, and transmits the deposit information, the sequence number and the alternate sequence number . . . and a cash information server which receives the deposit information, the sequence number and the alternate sequence number from the central control unit, and identifies the amount of cash collected at the business establishment before and after the armored car pickup." (Emphasis Added). Therefore, applicants request that the rejection of claims 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §101 be withdrawn.

### **III. Rejection of Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The Office Action states that "it is unclear and inconsistent with the specification regarding the second report identifying deposit information for the business day where the sequence numbers and the alternate sequence number are the same." The Office Action further states that "[t]he number according to the specification is adjusted at the end of the business day, not when there is a second report."

Applicants traverse the rejection because the subject matter of claim 10 is fully supported by the specification and drawings as filed, as explained in the amendment mailed November 13, 2003. For example, FIG. 4 of the application as filed clearly shows "[a]t the end of day 2, point C, a first E-mail is

**Appln No. 09/693,565**

**Amdt dat March 29, 2004**

**Reply to Office action of January 27, 2004**

preferably transmitted that includes sequence number 0021 and the adjusted alternate sequence number 0022. The first E-mail also includes cash information Y2 pertaining to cash collected during day 2 prior to the armored pickup. The sequence number is then adjusted to be identical to the alternate sequence number, i.e., 0022 and a second E-mail is transmitted that includes sequence number 0022 and the alternate sequence number 0022 (point D). The second E-mail includes cash information Z2 pertaining to cash collected during day 2 after the armored pick up." (Emphasis Added) (page 17, lines 26-35). As such, applicants submit that claim 10 is fully supported by the specification and the drawings as filed, and thus enabling.

In addition, the Office Action states "[a]dditionally, this would only occur if only one pickup occurs during the day, if two picks occur during the day the second deposit report would not have matching sequence number and alternate sequence numbers." Applicants do not believe that this statement has any bearing on the patentability of claim 10. If this statement were indeed true and the second deposit report would not have matching sequence number and alternate sequence number if two pickups occur during the day, perhaps such specific two-pickups-a-day system contemplated in the Office Action might not be covered by claim 10, but would not mean that claim 10 is either unclear or inconsistent.

In view of the above, applicants request that the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

Appln No. 09/693,565

Amdt date March 29, 2004

Reply to Office action of January 27, 2004

**IV. Rejection of claims 1-9, 17 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 1-9, 17 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,067,530 ("Brooks"). Further claims 1-10 and 17-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Brooks in view of Examiner's Official Notice.

Applicants appreciate the response to arguments in the Office Action in which the "Examiner contends Brooks, Jr. et al. discloses a central control unit configured to receive deposit information and transmit identifiers that distinguish deposit information accumulated during an accounting period before a predetermined event and deposit information accumulated during the accounting period after the predetermined event." The Examiner cites, by way of example, "the control unit (such as the central controller 36) generates and transmits deposit reports with identifiers based on received deposit information and transmit the identifiers (such as the reported totals between pickups and also shifts by cashiers, time and date stamps for events, canister identification, etc...)."

However, applicants submit that Brooks does not teach or suggest "a central control unit which receives deposit information from the safe assembly and generates and transmits deposit reports, and updates and transmits a pair of identifiers that distinguish deposit information accumulated during an accounting period before a predetermined event and deposit information accumulated during the accounting period after the predetermined event, wherein whether the deposit information was accumulated during the accounting period before the predetermined event or during the accounting period after the

**Appln No. 09/693,565**

**Amdt dat March 29, 2004**

**Reply to Office action of January 27, 2004**

predetermined event is indicated by whether the identifiers are different from one another or identical to each other." (Emphasis Added), recited in claim 1 as amended herein. The amendment to claim 1 indicated above would not require a new search, because the identifiers, for example, may be the sequence number and the alternate sequence number in the already considered claims 7-10. Therefore, applicants request that the amendment to claim 1 be entered, and the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Since claims 2-9 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, they incorporate all the terms and limitations of claim 1 in addition to other limitations, which together further patentably distinguish them over the cited references. Therefore, applicants request that the rejection of claims 2-9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Claim 17 as amended recites, in a relevant portion, "a central control unit which receives the deposit information from the safe assembly, updates a sequence number and an alternate sequence number, and transmits the deposit information, the sequence number and the alternate sequence number, wherein the alternate sequence number is updated upon an occurrence of an armored car pickup." (Emphasis Added) The Office Action nowhere states that such a central control unit is disclosed in Brooks. Therefore, applicants request that the rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Since claim 20 depends from claim 17, it incorporates all the terms and limitations of claim 17 in addition to other limitations, which together further patentably distinguish it

**Appln No. 09/693,565**

**Amdt date March 29, 2004**

**Reply to Office action of January 27, 2004**

over the cited references. Therefore, applicants request that the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) be withdrawn.

**V. Rejection of claims 1-10 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

In rejecting claims 1-10 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Examiner has taken an Official Notice that "the use of sequence and alternate sequence numbers are old and well known in the art of tracking transactions to provide coding which reveals status information about the transactions." Applicants traverse such assertion and request that the Examiner cite a reference in support of the assertion that "the use of sequence and alternate sequence numbers are old and well known" in compliance with MPEP § 2144.03.

Even if it were true that "the use of sequence and alternate sequence numbers are old and well known," which the applicants do not agree as discussed above, applicants submit that it would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the cash control system of Brooks with sequence and alternate sequence numbers to provide coding indicating the status of the transactions. One reason for the non-obviousness is that Brooks does not provide any teaching or suggestion of such combination, and a mere use of sequence and alternate sequence numbers, even if it can be shown in a reference, would not teach or suggest such combination.

As to claim 1, the cited references do not teach or suggest "a central control unit . . . wherein whether the deposit information was accumulated during the accounting period before the predetermined event or during the accounting period after

Appln No. 09/693,565

Amdt date March 29, 2004

R ply to Office action of January 27, 2004


the predetermined event is indicated by whether the identifiers are different from one another or identical to each other" as discussed above in reference to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). Further, claims 2-10 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, and incorporate all the terms and limitations of claim 1 in addition to other limitations, which together further patentably distinguish them over the cited references.

In view of the above, applicants request that the rejection of claims 1-10 and 17-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn and that they be allowed.

#### VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request an early issuance of a patent with claims 1-10 and 17-20. If there are any remaining issues that can be addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,  
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By   
Jun-Young E. Jeon  
Reg. No. 43,693  
626/795-9900

JEJ/llk

MEE PAS555816.1-\*--03/29/04 11:16 AM